

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Of these pending claims, Claims 1, 2 and 10-22 stand rejected and Claims 3-9 are objected to. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached a revised drawing for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet", reference signs 120 and 122 have been added to Figure 4 per the Examiner's request.

ABSTRACT

The Abstract stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the Abstract according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to amended independent Claims 10 and 16 which have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by any one of the following references: Chitty, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,854 B1), O'Connor, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,613 B1), Bradbury, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,125,680), Banducci, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,079,604), Banducci, et al. (EP 0 995 520 A2), Bradbury, et al. (EP 0 995 519 A2).

Applicants have incorporated the limitations of the allowable claims into the independent claims. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection has been rendered moot.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 3-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 14 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 16-22 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome

the rejections under 36 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants have amended Claims 3 and 10 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claims 3-11 and 15-21 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct 27 2005

By: 
Christopher A. Eusebi, Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CAE/smb